DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 441 023 TM 030 821

AUTHOR Melnick, Steven A.; Coyle, H. Elizabeth
TITLE Validation of a School Violence Prevention Assessment Tool.
PUB DATE 2000-04-25
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Prevention; Reliability; School Safety; *Teachers; Test Construction; *Validity; *Violence

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the development of an empirically valid and reliable assessment instrument that identifies areas of need in violence prevention skills within the student population. The completed instrument should allow a school district to choose a curriculum that aligns with their identified need at each developmentally-appropriate level (primary, intermediate, middle, and high school). A preliminary pool of 46 items was generated by two experts in school violence and reviewed by 52 graduate students who were practicing classroom teachers. A refined 43-item scale was administered to 311 classroom teachers. The overall sample was divided by grade level taught, and a one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if there were significant differences among levels with respect to their mean scores on each of the seven developed scales. Results indicate that some degree of development adjustment is necessary for violence prevention curricula. The scale should be useful as a dependent measure or covariate in experimental studies and as a trait indicator for descriptive studies of school district violence. An appendix contains the content validity rating form. (Contains 3 tables and 27 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 441 023

Validation of a School Violence Prevention Assessment Tool

Steven A. Melnick

H. Elizabeth Coyle

Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Melnick
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 25, 2000

TM030821

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Validation of a School Violence Prevention Assessment Tool

Steven A. Melnick

H. Elizabeth Coyle

Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg

Introduction

Schools reflect an increasingly violent society. Over 100,000 students bring weapons to school each day and 40 are killed or wounded with these weapons each year (Walker & Gresham, 1997). More than 6,000 teachers are threatened annually and well over 200 are physically injured by students on school grounds (Walker & Gresham, 1997). The National Association of School Security Directors estimates violent acts in schools cost American taxpayers nearly a billion dollars annually (Duhon-Sells, 1995).

The problem of school violence is difficult to define and measure (Furlong & Morrison, 1994). However, school violence is most often conceptualized as a range of antisocial behaviors extending from oppositionality and bullying to assaults and murder (Baker, 1998).

Enough data though has been collected to indicate a number of trends related to school violence. Research on school violence indicates that children are becoming more disruptive at younger ages and that what was once high school misbehaviors have reached the primary grades (Curwin & Mendler, 1997). Students report, with increasing numbers, avoidance of places at school out of fear of being victimized by a violent act

(Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 1998). Bullying, a specific type of violence, is taking on more serious forms and occurs more frequently than it did ten or fifteen years ago (Batsche & Knoff, 1994). Olweus (1994) indicates from his research in Scandinavian countries that fifteen percent of all students report being part of a victim/bullying incident on school property. There are indications from research conducted in the United States that the bullying problem may be more significant with closer to 21 percent of students reporting being involved in a bullying/victimization incident (Astor, 1995).

Public school districts across the United States are struggling to respond to the rising tide of violence occurring in their schools. Currently, a confusing array of violence prevention curricula is commercially available with some research supporting the relative strengths and limitations of each (Drug Strategies, 1998). These curricula focus on such constructs as anger management, empathy, social problem-solving skills, social resistance skills, communication, diversity, and community building. Unfortunately, no systematic method is available that assesses local district needs and then matches that need with the most effective curriculum for each age level.

There are approximately 215 violence prevention programs with little or no research to support effectiveness at the local level (Goldstein & Conoley, 1997). For example, over 5,000 schools in the United States are implementing conflict resolution or peer mediation programs (Hoffman, 1996). However, only a handful of conflict resolution programs have been researched regarding effectiveness in reducing violence (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997; Gottfredson, 1998; Powell & Hawkins, 1996).

Many programs are implemented with good intention but with little supportive evidence that it meets the needs of a particular district. Of even greater concern is the fact that Tolan and Guerra's (1998) extensive analysis of the programs evaluated to date indicate that, in some instances, there is a worsening of behaviors if the program is not matched with the need.

Purpose and Objective

To respond to these issues, this paper describes a research project designed to develop an empirically valid and reliable assessment instrument that identifies areas of need in violence prevention skills within the student population of each school district. The completed instrument will permit an individual school district to choose a curriculum that aligns with their identified need at each developmentally appropriate level (primary, intermediate, middle, and high school).

This instrument expands data collection regarding school based violence prevention issues by specifically targeting skill deficits identified through the needs assessment instrument. It will permit districts to implement a violence prevention curriculum that is focused on remediation of identified, localized skill deficits rather than randomly choosing and implementing a curriculum.

Theoretical Framework

There are a number of theoretical viewpoints undergirding the development of the needs assessment instrument and its implementation in a school setting: (1) schools can play a critical role in impacting violence prevention efforts in the United States; (2)

school-based implementation of violence prevention initiatives must be comprehensive in nature; (3) there is evidence to support the fact that teaching social skills to students reduces the incidence of aggressive behaviors; (4) there is at least a beginning body of literature indicating which social skills should be targeted for remediation; and (5) there is a need to examine the effectiveness of program implementation through a developmental perspective.

First, there is evidence to support the fact that schools can be key players in the larger violence prevention efforts developing across the United States. However, "there have not been strong empirical efforts to conceptualize the uniqueness of school violence or the school's role in facilitating or stemming violent behavior" (Astor, 1995, p. 107). There is a growing body of literature indicating that schools can serve as a "protective factor" in reducing risk for violent behaviors (Garbarino, et. al., 1992). "Recent research suggest that some of the most promising prevention strategies involve education and skills training – things schools are uniquely qualified to do" (Drug Strategies, 1998). The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funded a demonstration project of a variety of school-based approaches to violence prevention. The findings indicate that violence prevention in schools can work but there is a "need for definitive studies to determine the precise strategies or components of programs that are effective in reducing aggression and violence (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997). The research study described in this paper focuses on the development of social skills based needs assessment tool within a school setting, further extends the beginning research base that points to a definitive role that schools can play in violence prevention, and specifically investigates the role that remediation of social skills deficits can play in the overall violence prevention efforts.

Second, a review of the literature indicates that a school district's response to the multiple facets of violence presented by its student population must be comprehensive (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997; Powell & Hawkins, 1996; Tolan & Guerra, 1998). Research on school violence prevention indicates that the most effective approaches include four elements: (1) safety plans and environmental scanning (Stephens, 1994); (2) zero-tolerance-for-violence policies and procedures (Stephens, 1994); (3) development and implementation of crisis intervention and postvention plans (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997); and (4) effective violence prevention curriculum (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997; Gottfredson, 1998; Powell & Hawkins, 1996).

The first three elements deal mainly with administrative issues where it is commonplace to adopt plans, policies, and procedures from other districts with slight modifications to fit local needs. The fourth element, curriculum, provides a greater challenge, however, as the curriculum selected must meet the developmentally appropriate needs of students at each grade level. While there is an array of violence prevention programs available with some initial research conducted by the Center of Disease Control that evaluates the effectiveness of these programs broadly (Drug Strategies, 1998), there is little or no research to support effectiveness at the local level.

Third, there is evidence to support the fact that teaching social skills reduces the incidence of aggressive behaviors. A number of researchers have documented that violent behavior is an individual social skills deficit problem (Larson, 1994; Spivak & Shure, 1984). The social skill deficit model is grounded in social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) and based on the premise that aggression is a learned behavior. Additionally, research indicates that young children who exhibit chronic patterns of

aggressive behavior are at serious risk for continued aggression unless intervention occurs in the elementary years (Lochman, White, & Wayland, 1991).

Social skills remediation interventions emphasize behavioral skill development and practice to increase pro-social responses in interpersonal situations, thereby, reducing the risk for violent behavior (Tolan & Guerra, 1998). In her review of 149 school violence prevention programs, Gottfredson (1986) concludes that most comprehensive social competency promotion programs work better than programs which do not focus on social skill development and those that only focus on resistance skill training. Additionally, numerous research studies have examined the impact of the PATHS program developed for grades K-5 that focuses on understanding, expressing and managing feelings, and social problem solving (Greenberg, 19?). "Studies report that students in the PATHS program show less aggression toward peers and have fewer behavioral problems than students who have not participated in the program" (Drug Strategies, 1998, p. 3).

The validation of the needs assessment tool that is the focus of this research study, positions schools to more specifically identify violence prevention curricula that fits with the links identified in the literature between remediation in social skills deficit and effective violence prevention efforts.

Fourth, there is a beginning body of evidence indicating which social skills should be targeted for remediation. In their extensive research conducted in compiling a comprehensive assessment of currently available school violence prevention, a Washington, D.C. research organization, Drug Strategies, concluded that effective violence prevention programs "inform students about the negative consequences of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

violence and teach students the following skills: anger management; social perspective taking; social problem solving; peer negotiation; conflict management; peer resistance skills; active listening and effective communication" (Drug Strategies, 1998, p. 3). Dusenbury, et. al. (1997) include anger management, perspective-taking, decision-making, resisting peer pressure, active listening, and education on prejudice, sexism, racism, and male-female relationships in their recommendations on which social competencies should be addressed in school-based violence prevention. Targeting impulsivity, anger management, and empathy for prevention of aggressive behavior in children has received extensive support in the literature as well (Larson, 1994).

However, it is unclear from the research which social skills might have the most potent impact on violence prevention. Additionally, there is no evidence to conclude whether the strengthening of a particular cluster of social skills at the elementary level to prevent the risk for violence would also hold true for the middle school level or the high school level. Larson (1994) concludes that the specific relationships between social skill development and violence prevention "is blurred at best" (p. 151). The development of a social skills needs assessment tool will further the research efforts to determine which social skills to target in an effective violence prevention effort. This study furthers these research efforts by developing an evaluative method for assessing specific social skill deficits (anger management, empathy, social problem solving, diversity, safe and orderly environment, social resistance, and communication) by grade level and by systematically remediating those deficits through planful and targeted implementation of violence prevention curricula.

Finally, there is a need to examine effectiveness of violence prevention program implementation through a developmental perspective. Dusenbury, et. al. (1997) note that violence prevention programs should begin in the primary grades and be reinforced across all grade levels. Additionally, they argue that "it is reasonable to expect that interventions will only be effective when they appreciate the developmental stage of their target audience; however, no studies have been conducted to test this assumption" (Dusenbury, et. al., 1997). In her review of school-based prevention interventions, Gottfredson (1986) concludes that there is a need for more narrow evaluation of violence prevention programs across location (urban, rural, and suburban) and by grade level and argues that it is only through examination of specific program activities that we can create a more comprehensive picture of prevention activities.

Purpose and Objective

To respond to these issues, the intent of this paper is to report on the development of an empirically valid and reliable assessment instrument that identifies areas of need in violence prevention skills within the student population. The completed instrument will permit an individual school district to choose a curriculum that aligns with their identified need at each developmentally appropriate level (primary, intermediate, middle, and high school).

Methodology

This section will discuss the procedures used for content validation of the School Violence Needs Assessment. In addition, the internal consistency reliability estimate

analysis will be presented. Finally, the analyses used to detect differences among development groups will be discussed.

Content Validation. Content validation is certainly one of the most important steps in preparing an affective assessment tool. As Gable and Wolf (1993, p. 96) contend "Content validation should receive the highest priority during the process of instrument development. Unfortunately, some developers rush through the process with little appreciation for its enormous importance, only to find that their instrument "does not work" (lack of construct validity or internal consistency reliability) when the response data are obtained." Substantial time was spent on the content validation stage of this instrument. The initial phase of development of the school violence prevention instrument was completed during the spring and summer of 1999. The preliminary pool of 46 items was generated by two experts in school violence at Penn State Harrisburg and reviewed by a sample of 52 graduate students at the university who are practicing classroom teachers. In support of judgmental content validity, the graduate students were asked to match pilot items (e.g., My students are able to work out minor conflicts among themselves; My students are interested in finding out how others think and feel; My students are aware of the classroom rules that create a safe learning environment) against seven *a priori* categorical traits identified in the literature to be related to school violence prevention: Anger Management, Empathy, Social Problem Solving, Social Resistance Skills, Communications, Diversity, and Building a Peaceful Community. To complete the content review, the graduate students were asked to rate the extent to which the item belongs in the respective category (see Appendix A). Students were provided with the conceptual definitions for each construct (i.e., category) and a list of the preliminary

items. They were asked to read each item carefully and place it in the category they felt it best fit. The extent to which these content judges successfully placed the items in the *a priori* categories intended by the researchers is evidence of judgmental content validity. Percent of agreement greater than 80% was targeted.

The final instrument consisted of 43 items which respondents were asked to rate each statement on a 5-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree).

Internal Consistency Reliability. Alpha internal consistency reliability addresses an important source of error due to the sampling of items from the domain (Gable & Wolf, 1993). To the extent that alpha reliabilities are acceptable (i.e., greater than .70 for an affective measure), it is deduced that the items sufficiently sample the domain intended. After collecting pilot data from a sample of 311 classroom teachers, items were grouped according to the *a priori* categories intended by the researchers and alpha internal consistency reliabilities were computed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Item means, standard deviations, correlation of the item with the domain, alpha if item deleted, and the overall alpha for the category were computed. Based on t his analysis, recommendations for modifications to the instrument are made.

Developmental Levels. In order to determine if there are differences among developmental levels as suggested by Dusenbury, et. al. (1997) and Gottfredson (1986), the overall sample was divided into primary, intermediate, middle, and high school groups. The oneway ANOVA procedure was utilized to determine if any groups were significantly different from one another on each scale. As the sample sizes were unequal, the Scheffe' post hoc test was used to determine which groups differed.

Results

Content Validation. Table 1 contains the results of the content validation phase of this research. There were 46 original items on the initial draft of the instrument. The left hand column of Table 1 indicates the original item number. The second column indicates what action, if any was taken after review of the judgemental data and what item number was assigned for the final form. The right hand column contains the percent of agreement among content judges in placing the item in the correct *a priori* category.

In the area of Anger Management, the original item #2 was deleted from the scale as only 54 percent of the content judges placed it in the correct category. In reviewing the items for this category, #2 stood out from the rest in that it did not require a cognitive act (expression, thinking, awareness) but rather a physical act (i.e., walking away). It is likely that content judges detect the subtle difference in wording and thus were not satisfied that it belonged in this category. Because there were sufficient items remaining on the scale, the item was simply deleted. All other items on this scale received 92% agreement or better.

Of the six items on the Empathy scale, three received levels of agreement greater than 87%. One item (27) received only a 75% rating. After further review by the authors, it was decided to leave the item in the instrument for the next round of data collection. If the item contributed to the overall alpha reliabilities of the scale it would likely be left in. Item 5 received only 65% agreement and was re-written from its original form.

The Social Problem Solving scale contained seven items. All items except number 11 were properly placed in the appropriate category by 81% or more of the

content judges. Number 11 received only 12% agreement. As the concept of the item was deemed important, the authors re-wrote the item to better reflect the category.

There were a total of seven items on the Social Resistance Skills scale. Two items (34 and 36) received low levels of agreement (23% each) and were deleted from the scale. Item 9 received 67% agreement and was edited to be more consistent with other items in the scale.

In the areas of Communication, Diversity, and Safe and Orderly Environment all items on each scale received levels of agreement greater than 80% and all were retained.

Alpha Internal Consistency Reliability. Items were grouped according to the construct they purported to measure and alpha internal consistency reliabilities were calculated for each scale. Item level statistics provide some insights into the contribution each item makes to the overall alpha of the scale. Table 2 displays the domain name (scale), item numbers comprising that scale, means and standard deviations, the correlation of each item with the domain, the alpha if the item were deleted from the scale, and the overall domain alpha reliability estimate.

According to Gable and Wolf (1993), alpha reliabilities equal to or greater than .70 for an affective measure are desirable. As can be seen in the right hand column of Table 2, all scales have alpha levels of at least .74 or higher. In fact, of the seven scales five had alpha levels equal to or greater than .80. As can be seen in the "domain if alpha deleted" column of Table 2, all items on these five scales (Social Problem Solving, Empathy, Communication, Safe and Orderly Environment, and Social Resistance) contribute to the overall level of alpha.

The Diversity scale had an alpha level of .74 and is considered acceptable. The Anger Management scale, however, had an alpha level of .65 and is below the criterion established by Gable and Wolf. As can be seen in Table 2, the items have a modest correlation with the domain and contribute to the overall alpha level. In such cases, the addition of items to the scale so that they better reflect the domain is warranted. The formula $K=rel_{des}(1-rel_{ex})/rel_{ex}(1-rel_{des})$ gives us an estimate of the number of times a scale need be increased to obtained the desired alpha level (rel_{des}=desired reliability; rel_{ex}=existing reliability; K= number of times the scale need to be increased to yield rel_{des}). Using this formula, the Anger Management scale should be increased by a factor of 1.26. Thus for this four item scale, the addition of at least one more item should increase the alpha level above .70. To raise it to the levels of the other scales (i.e., >.80), the scale would need to be increased by a factor of 2.15 resulting in 4 items being added to the existing scale. Subsequent versions of the instrument will incorporate these findings.

Development Levels. Table 3 presents the results of the oneway ANOVA analysis of developmental levels. The sample was divided into primary, intermediate, middle, and high school levels (n=99, 117, 32, and 49 respectively). The oneway procedure was used to determine if there were significant differences among the levels with respect to their mean scores on each of the seven scales. Significant differences ($p \geq .05$) were found on five of the seven scales. Communication and Anger Management showed no significant differences among groups.

As can be seen on Table 3, the Primary Level was significantly difference from one or more groups on the Social Problem Solving, Empathy, Safe and Orderly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Environment, Diversity, and Social Resistance scales. In every case, teachers tended to rate the Primary Level higher than the upper grade levels. Interestingly, on the Social Problem Solving and Social Resistance scales the Primary Level was significantly different from the Intermediate Level but not significantly different from the Middle or High School Levels. There is an interesting pattern in the data, albeit not necessarily significant, that emerges when one examines the trends from Primary to High School levels. Notice that the means for Primary are consistently highest; however, the means then tend to dip at the Intermediate and Middle levels, rising again at the High School Level across Social Problem Solving, Empathy, Safe and Orderly Environment, and Anger Management. These trends clearly indicate that some degree of development adjustments in violence prevention curricula are necessary.

Educational and Scientific Importance of the Research

The resulting scale should be useful as a dependent measure or a covariate in experimental studies and as a trait indicator in descriptive studies of school district violence. Most importantly, the assessment instrument will be useful as a diagnostic tool for school districts interested in curbing acts of violence and teaching children appropriate alternatives. Finally, given the match between this particular scale's thrust and the dramatic prominence of violence in our public schools, this instrument proves to be both unique and timely.

Table 1

Percent of Content Judges Placing the Item in the Correct *A Priori* Category
(n=52)

Original Item No.	Final Item No.	Item	Percent
Anger Management			
2	Deleted	My students are able to walk away from a physical confrontation with others.	54
14	13	My students are able to express their anger without hurting others.	94
25	24	My students are able to think things through before acting when they are angry.	94
33	32	My students are aware of what triggers their anger.	92
40	37	My students are able to express their anger without hurting others.	98
46	43	My students are able to calm themselves down when they are angry.	96
Empathy			
3	2	My students are able to care about the feelings of the characters in the literature we read in the classroom.	87
5	4	My students do not laugh at jokes that hurt other people's feelings.	65
12	11	My students care about another person's point of view.	87
22	21	My students feel badly when another student is being teased, ostracized, or bullied by others.	87
27	26	My students care about the thoughts expressed by others in day-to-day relationships.	75
39	36	My students are able to show concern for others when they are hurt or upset.	90
Social Problem Solving			
1	1	My students are able to work out minor conflicts amongst themselves.	83
4	3	My students area able to choose a proposed solution to a problem to see if it works.	89
11	10	My students are able to stand up for themselves without verbally or physically harming others.	12

Table 1 (continued...)

Percent of Content Judges Placing the Item in the Correct *A Priori* Category (n=52)

Original Item No.	Final Item No.	Item	Percent
Social Problem Solving (Continued..)			
20	19	My students are willing to try a proposed solution to a problem even if it wasn't the solution they wanted.	81
30	29	My students are able to work out problems that arise in cooperative learning groups.	90
32	31	My students utilize effective problem solving strategies for making decisions about their relationships with others.	90
38	35	My students are able to brainstorm solutions to problems that crop up in our classroom.	90
Social Resistance Skills			
9	8	My students do not join in with their friends when someone is being teased.	67
13	12	My students are able to stand firm in their own values and beliefs with peers.	87
17	16	My students are able to say no to friends when they are planning to do something that is dangerous or unlawful.	87
24	23	My students are able to say no to friends when they are planning to do something they disagree with.	87
26	25	My students are able to say what they believe in and not back down under peer pressure.	83
34	Deleted	My students speak out when other students are being verbally or physically harmed.	23
36	Deleted	My students are able to tell another students to stop doing a behavior that is hurting them.	23

Table 1 (continued...)

Percent of Content Judges Placing the Item in the Correct *A Priori* Category (n=52)

Original Item No.	Final Item No.	Item	Percent
Communication			
6	5	My students are able to get their point across to others in a way that is understood.	90
15	14	My students are able to listen to others attentively during communications with others.	90
18	17	My students are able to correctly read the non-verbal communications (body language, facial expressions, voice tone) of others.	83
29	28	My students are able to clearly say what they think.	92
31	30	My students are able to say what they think and/or feel and be understood by others.	94
35	33	My students are able to clearly say what they feel.	90
41	38	My students are able to communicate their needs and wants in a way that others understand.	90
Diversity			
8	7	My students are interested in finding out about individual differences in others.	96
23	22	My students treat each other with respect regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or physical characteristics.	94
43	40	My students feel free to express pride in their individual race, ethnicity, gender, or physical characteristics.	85
45	42	My students are able to accept individual differences in others rather than expecting everyone to think and feel the same.	87

Table 1 (continued…)

Percent of Content Judges Placing the Item in the Correct *A Priori* Category (n=52)

Original Item No.	Final Item No.	Item	Percent
Safe & Orderly Environment			
7	6	My students feel safe from verbal and physical harm when they walk into the school building.	94
10	9	My students follow the school-wide rules that create a safe community environment.	87
16	15	My students are aware of the classroom rules that create a safe learning environment.	85
19	18	My students feel certain that all of the adults in our school are there to protect them and keep them safe from verbal and physical harm.	92
21	20	My students feel safe from verbal and physical harm when they are in our classroom.	98
28	27	My students follow the classroom rules that create a safe learning environment.	85
37	34	My students feel safe from verbal and physical harm when they walk onto the school grounds.	96
42	39	My students are aware of the school-wide rules that create a safe community environment.	89
44	41	My students know that the school-wide rules and policies created to protect them from physical and verbal harm will be enforced consistently.	89

Table 2

Alpha Reliability Estimates by Scale
(n=302)

Domain	Item	Mean	S.D.	r with Domain	Domain Alpha if Item Deleted	Domain Alpha Reliability
	1	3.63	.91	.49	.79	
	3	3.61	.82	.59	.78	
	10	3.40	.88	.60	.77	
Social Problem Solving	19	3.59	.72	.43	.80	.81
	29	3.43	.84	.59	.78	
	31	3.15	.80	.54	.79	
	35	3.85	.78	.57	.78	
	2	3.60	.82	.48	.82	
	4	2.77	1.12	.51	.83	
	11	3.39	.82	.68	.79	
Empathy	21	3.51	.95	.69	.79	.83
	24	2.80	.88	.51	.82	
	26	3.32	.83	.64	.80	
	36	3.98	.72	.62	.81	
	5	3.60	.80	.56	.79	
	14	3.23	.95	.47	.81	
	17	3.39	.91	.37	.82	
Communication	28	3.56	.84	.66	.77	.82
	30	3.60	.77	.63	.78	
	33	3.41	.85	.67	.77	
	38	3.62	.72	.58	.80	

Continued....

Table 2 (Continued...)

Alpha Reliability Estimates by Scale
(n=302)

Domain	Item	Mean	S.D.	r with Domain	Domain Alpha if Item Deleted	Domain Alpha Reliability
	6	3.70	.97	.67	.85	
	9	3.76	.79	.64	.85	
	15	4.32	.55	.47	.87	
	18	4.12	.86	.59	.86	
Safe & Orderly Environ.	20	4.21	.77	.68	.85	.87
	27	4.01	.65	.66	.85	
	34	3.74	.86	.69	.85	
	39	4.27	.57	.52	.87	
	41	3.91	.94	.60	.86	
	7	3.15	.96	.53	.67	
Diversity	22	3.38	1.03	.61	.64	.74
	40	3.65	.83	.43	.74	
	42	3.49	.86	.59	.66	
	8	2.80	1.02	.49	.81	
	12	3.30	.88	.60	.76	
Social Resistance	16	3.45	.80	.61	.76	.80
	23	3.33	.80	.71	.73	
	25	3.15	.80	.57	.77	
	13	3.34	.84	.44	.57	
Anger Management	32	3.07	.92	.33	.66	.65
	37	3.74	.68	.47	.57	
	43	3.19	.88	.51	.52	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Oneway Analysis of Variance for each Scale by Level

Scale	Primary Level (n=99)	Intermediate Level (n=117)	Middle School Level (n=32)	High School Level (n=49)	F-value
Social Problem Solving	3.64	3.38	3.44	3.62	4.69 * [1]
Empathy	3.60	3.13	3.20	3.35	12.06 ** [2]
Communication	3.53	3.48	3.38	3.47	.60
Safe & Orderly Environment	4.27	3.82	3.86	3.94	14.40 ** [3]
Diversity	3.83	3.21	3.13	3.14	23.99 ** [4]
Social Resistance	3.37	3.02	3.25	3.23	5.97 ** [5]
Anger Management	3.35	3.24	3.34	3.43	1.46

* $p \geq .05$; ** $p \geq .001$

[1] Primary significantly differed from Intermediate.
[2] Primary was significantly different from Intermediate and Middle School.
[3] Primary was significantly different from all other groups.
[4] Primary was significantly different from all other groups.
[5] Primary significantly differed from Intermediate.

References

Astor, R.A. (1995). School Violence: A blueprint for elementary school interventions. National Association of Social Workers, 4(3), 101-113.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baker, J.A. (1998). Are we missing the forest for the trees? Considering the social context of school violence. Journal of School Psychology, 36(1), 29-44.

Batsche, G. M., & Knoff, H. M. (1994). Bullies and their victims: Understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. School Psychology Review, 23(2), 165-174.

Curwin, R. L. & Mendler, A. N. (1997). As tough as necessary: Countering violence, aggression, and hostility in our schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dahlberg, L. (1998). Youth violence in the United States: Major trends, risk factors, and prevention approaches. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14(4), 259-272.

Dodge, K. A. (1993). Effects of intervention on children at high risk for conduct problems. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, LA.

Drug Strategies. (1998). Safe schools safe students: A guide to violence prevention strategies. Washington, D. C.

Duhon-Sells, R. M. (Ed.). (1995). Dealing with violence: What schools and communities need to know. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Dusenbury, L., Falco, M., Lake, A., Branigan, R., & Bosworth, K. (1997). Nine critical elements of promising violence prevention programs. Journal of School Health, 67(10), 409-414.

Furlong, M. J., & Smith, D. C. (Eds.). (1994). Anger, hostility, and aggression: Assessment, prevention and intervention. Brandon, VT: Clinical Psychology Publishing Co., Inc.

Gable, R. K., & Wolf, M.B. (1993). Instrument development in the affective domain (2nd Ed.). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Garbarino, J. (1992). Children and families in the social environment. NY: Aldine DeGruyter.

Goldstein, A. P., & Conoley, J. C. (Eds.). (1997). School violence intervention: A practical handbook. NY: The Guilford Press.

Gottfredson, D. (1998). School based crime prevention. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Greenberg, M. T., Kutsche, C. A., & Speltz, M. (1990). Emotional regulation, self-control and psychopathology: The role of relationships in early childhood. In D. Cichetti & S. Toth (Eds.), Rochester symposium on developmental psychopathology NY: Cambridge University Press.

Haggerty, R., Sherrod, L., Garmezy, N., & Rutter, M. (Eds.). (1996). Stress, risk, and resilience in children and adolescents: Processes, Mechanisms, and Interventions. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffman, A. M. (Ed.). (1996). Schools, violence, and society. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Kauffman, P., Chen, X., & Choy, S. (1998). Indicators of School Crime and Safety 1998. Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Larson, J. (1994). Violence prevention in the schools: A review of selected programs and procedures. School Psychology Review, 23(2), 151-163.

Lochman, J.E., White, K.J., & Wayland, K.K. (1991). Cognitive-behavioral assessment and treatment with aggressive children. In P. C. Kendall (Ed.), Child and adolescent therapy: Cognitive-behavioral procedures. NY: Guilford Press.

Powell, K.E., & Hawkins, D.E. (Eds.) (1996). Youth violence prevention: Descriptions and baseline data from 13 evaluation projects. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 12(5) (Suppl.).

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Spivak, G., Platt, J., & Shure, M. (1976). The problem-solving approach to adjustment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stephens, R.D. (1994). Planning for safer and better schools: School violence prevention and intervention strategies. School Psychology Review, 23(2), 204-215.

Tolan, P. H., & Guerra, N. G. (1998). What works in reducing adolescent violence: An empirical review of the field. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

Walker, H., & Gresham, F. (1997). Making schools safer and violence free. Intervention, 32(4), 1999-203.

Appendix A

Content Validity Rating Form

School Violence Prevention Needs Assessment

Instructions

1. Carefully read the conceptual definitions for each category listed below. For each item stem, please fill in the category letter (A, B, C, D, E, F, G) that you believe each statement best fits. (Statements not fitting any category should be placed in Category H.)

Categories	Conceptual Definitions
A. Anger Management	The ability to identify anger experienced within oneself and to resolve it through non-destructive communication with others or through healthy internal coping mechanisms.
B. Empathy	The ability to care about the thoughts, feelings or actions of another person.
C. Social Problem Solving	The ability to find alternative solutions to issues and conflicts that arise in interpersonal relationships.
D. Social Resistance Skills	The ability to identify and act in accordance with one's own set of values and beliefs rather than bending to meet peer approval.
E. Communications	The ability to attend to and decode the thoughts, feelings and actions expressed by others and to express clearly one's own thoughts and feelings.
F. Diversity	The ability to respect individual differences in others and to learn from the unique cultural variations of race, ethnicity, gender, age, and physical characteristics.
G. Safe & Orderly Environment	Feeling safe and secure in the school and classroom.
H. Other	Statement does not fit into any of the above categories

---